



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,050	12/30/2003	Pol O. Morain	D/A1633 (1508/3671)	6786
7590 Gunnar G. Leinberg, Esq. Nixon Peabody, LLP P.O. Box 31051 Rochester, NY 14603			EXAMINER RIMELL, SAMUEL G	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/22/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/748,050

Applicant(s)

MORAIN ET AL.

Examiner

Sam Rimell

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/23/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2164

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent 6,466,915) in view of Reiner et al. (U.S. Patent 7,165,105).

Claim 1: FIG. 1 of Suzuki illustrates a first device in the form of a terminal (200).

The terminal is a computer terminal and thus inherently includes a digital content storage system in the form of internal memory.

The graphical user interface of FIG. 25 of Suzuki is a monitoring system that appears on the terminal and monitors the selection of specific files, such as the selection of “flower-pattern one piece dress. Making selections generates usage data, such a color size price and quantity purchased, which are subsequently sent to the central processing center (100) in FIG. 1.

The data fields, such as the data fields containing the named color “pink” and the price “6.800” are the usage data storage system since these fields store usage data until it is sent to the central processing center (100) in FIG. 1.

FIG. 11 illustrates a table which forms the usage metrics system. The table permits inferred conclusions, such as the conclusion that a customer prefers a specific size, as illustrated at C in FIG. 7C and described at col. 18, lines 1-6. The table of FIG. 11 is located in the order reception file (3) (col. 13, liens 66-67) which is part of the central processing center (100) and forms a second device remote from the first device (terminal 200).

Art Unit: 2164

Suzuki differs in that it does not disclose usage events that include play event types describing how the content is consumed and a time stamp indicating when the event occurred.

However, Reiner at FIG. 3B discloses an interface which can create data model which records a play event type (viewing web pages) that describes how digital content is consumed (number of pages viewed during a visit and number of visits during a time period) and a time stamp indicating when the event occurred (the time period of visits from starting date to ending date).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Suzuki to further include a data model which records additional usage events in the form of a play event type (viewing of web pages) which describes how the content is used and timestamps indicating the period of use. Such modification would have been motivated by the advantage of gauging web marketing performance for e-business decisions, as specified at col. 1, lines 20-30 of Reiner.

Claim 2: The data of FIG. 11 is organized into a plurality of categories, including genre type (good information—102).

Claim 3: The first device (electronic terminal) obtains its digital content from the merchant providing the goods.

Claim 4: Col. 17, lines 40-53, and in particular, lines 40-44 outline a digital content recommendation system based on the information in the usage metrics. The customer may be recommended specific merchandise via digital advertisement (“goods introduction”) to the customer on the basis of past purchases.

Art Unit: 2164

Claim 5: The merchant uses the metrics system to select products to recommend to the consumer via digital advertisement ('goods introduction').

Claim 6: The merchant providing the content is a marketing company.

Claim 7: The selections which are made available to the customer are presented as digital documents (FIG. 21, 22A-22C and 23).

Claim 8: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 9: See remarks for claim 2.

Claim 10: See remarks for claim 3.

Claim 11: See remarks for claim 4.

Claim 12: See remarks for claim 5.

Claim 13: See remarks for claim 6.

Claim 14: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 15: See remarks for claim 2.

Claim 16: See remarks for claim 3.

Claim 17: See remarks for claim 4.

Claim 18: See remarks for claim 5.

Claim 19: See remarks for claim 6.

Claim 23: As seen in FIG. 25 of Suzuki, the resulting input data can include a preference for a color of an article or a size of an article.

Claim 24: As seen in FIG. 25 of Suzuki, the resulting input data can indicate the consuming habits of a consumer, such as purchasing dresses.

Claim 25: See remarks for claim 23.

Art Unit: 2164

Claim 26: See remarks for claim 24.

Claim 27: See remarks for claim 23.

Claim 28: See remarks for claim 24.

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent 6,466,915) in view of Reiner et al. (U.S. Patent 7,165,105) and further in view of Henrick (U.S. Patent 6,507,727).

Claim 20-22: FIGS. 5A-5C of Henrick illustrate a portable device which can download digital audio content, such as a song file ("download song"). The portable device is thus a digital audio player. The digital content can be purchased (abstract, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the terminal (200) of Suzuki et al. to be a portable cellular terminal configured to additionally download audio content as taught by Henrick so as to permit portability of the terminal and permit both physical items (clothing) and digital content (songs) to be purchased from the same system.

Remarks

Applicant's amendments have overcome all previous grounds of rejection. This office action contains new grounds of rejection and is thus made non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (571) 272-4084.



Sam Rimell
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2164